UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . Criminal No. 1:04cr385

•

vs. . Alexandria, Virginia

June 11, 2020

1

ALI AL-TIMIMI, 2:09 p.m.

.

Defendant. .

. . . . . . . . . . .

TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEONIE M. BRINKEMA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES: (by telephone)

FOR THE GOVERNMENT: JOHN T. GIBBS, AUSA

GORDON D. KROMBERG, AUSA DANIEL T. YOUNG, AUSA

United States Attorney's Office

2100 Jamieson Avenue Alexandria, VA 22314

FOR THE DEFENDANT: THOMAS M. HUFF, ESQ.

P.O. Box 2248

Leesburg, VA 210177

and

JONATHAN TURLEY, ESQ.

The George Washington University

Law School

2000 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20052

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: ANNELIESE J. THOMSON, RDR, CRR

U.S. District Court, Fifth Floor

401 Courthouse Square Alexandria, VA 22314

(703)299-8595

(Pages 1 - 21)

COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES

```
3
 1
              MR. HUFF: Yes.
 2
               MR. YOUNG: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: And we're having trouble hearing you.
 4
    Hold on one second.
 5
               All right. Mr. Huff, speak a little softer. Let me
 6
    hear you again.
 7
               MR. HUFF: Okay. Check one, two, three.
 8
               THE COURT: That's much better.
 9
               All right. And, Mr. Young, let me hear from you. A
     little softer.
10
11
               MR. YOUNG: The rain in Spain falls mainly in the
12
    plain.
13
               THE COURT: You're hard to understand. Are you on a
14
     speaker phone, cell phone? What are you on?
15
               MR. YOUNG: I'm on a voice over IP connection.
                                                               I can
16
     try calling the line back from a different phone, Your Honor,
17
     if I'm not intelligible.
18
               THE COURT: Well, you're intelligible, but it's
19
    difficult. So I think the phone is a better way to do this,
20
    but we'll try.
21
               MR. YOUNG: Okay. I will dial in momentarily, Your
22
    Honor.
23
               THE COURT: All right. We'll wait for you.
24
               While we're waiting, Mr. Kromberg, are you there
25
     still?
```

```
4
               THE CLERK: He didn't hear you. I had it on mute.
 1
 2
     It's off mute now.
 3
               THE COURT: All right. Mr. Young, are you there?
 4
               MR. YOUNG:
                          This is Dan Young for the government.
 5
               THE COURT: All right. That's much better, all
     right?
 6
 7
               So now we have Mr. Huff and Mr. Young on the phone.
 8
     And again, please state your name first. Just say "Huff" or
 9
     "Young," and then say whatever you're going to say.
10
               All right. So this matter is before the Court, and
11
     the only matter I'm hearing today is the defendant's emergency
12
     motion for release from custody pending appeal. I want
13
     Mr. Huff first -- I'm sorry, Mr. Young first. Can you tell me
14
     what is your knowledge of the status of any COVID infections at
15
     Super Max?
16
               MR. YOUNG: Yes. This is Young. The government
17
     reached out to our contact at FCC Florence, and that includes
18
     all the Florence facilities, among them ADX Florence, where the
19
     defendant is housed, and as of this morning, there are no
20
     reported cases of COVID-19 among either staff or inmates in the
21
    FCC Florence series of facilities.
22
               THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Huff, that is
23
     certainly a factor which the Court has to take into
24
     consideration in evaluating your motion, because right now,
25
     ironically, your client is actually in a safer environment
```

vis-a-vis the virus than he would be if he was living in the District of Columbia.

MR. HUFF: So I acknowledge that, Your Honor, but at the same time, I think the, the *Harris* court dealt with this same situation in D.D.C., also evaluating a section 3145(c) motion in the context of the pandemic, and the *Harris* court observed that while, you know, uncertainty is endemic in the present circumstances, that uncertainty can't preclude courts from acting until the damage is done.

I think especially for a person like our client, who has certain underlying health conditions, should he contact -- or should he contract COVID-19, it may well be too late, especially because, you know, in this particular prison situation, any sort of medical transfer requires -- at least it's our understanding requires special FBI approval that's not readily granted.

THE COURT: All right. And again, I don't quite know why we're getting so much strange background noise on your connection, but we're going to have to put up with it for now.

Well, as you know, this is an unusual case because unlike most of the motions for compassionate release, in Mr. Al-Timimi's situation, he has not yet -- his case is on appeal. I haven't had any other cases where the individual was on -- was in custody and there was an appeal pending.

And so under 18 U.S.C., Section 3145(c), I've got to

find by clear and convincing evidence, number one, that

Mr. Timimi does not pose a risk or a danger -- a risk of flight

or a danger to the community, and I don't think the government

is arguing that that actually would be the case. He was on

bond throughout the court proceedings. But for his conviction

for the one offense that carries life imprisonment, he would

probably have been allowed to self-surrender; and while he was

on bond for quite a long time while the proceedings were going

on, there were absolutely, to my knowledge, no problems with

his fully satisfying all the conditions.

So I think the first factor clearly goes in his favor, and I think the government basically doesn't dispute that. It's the second and third factors, that is, whether his appeal raises a substantial question likely to result in reversal, a new trial, or a sentence of time served; and the third factor, that there are exceptional reasons why his detention is no longer appropriate.

I think the COVID-19 virus threat plus the underlying health conditions of Mr. Timimi are certainly relevant factors that go into that third consideration. The second factor, though, the second consideration about the appeal is a really fascinating one because even at the time of the trial, I was concerned and voiced some concern about some of the unique legal issues; and, of course, now that has become more complicated in the post-Johnson-Davis era, where at least two

of the counts of conviction are most likely vulnerable to being set aside.

So I really, I guess, want to hear from the government as to why you think this defendant should not be allowed to be released on bond especially given the fact that he's already served well over ten years of incarceration. And were the defense to be successful in, in getting these counts that are still at issue reversed, then it would be a manifest injustice that he would have been serving time for offenses which are no longer valid.

So I want to hear the government's response to that.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, Your Honor. This is Mr. Young. I would say a few things. At the outset, I think the overarching argument is sort of the one with which we concluded our filing in this case, which is while, of course, Your Honor is correct that this defendant has served a substantial period of incarceration, the government's position throughout this litigation has been that these are extraordinarily serious offenses; and to the extent that there are consecutive sentences with mandatory minimums, I think the government's position would be that that reflects Congress's judgment that somebody who before the first step-back violated 924(c) or was liable for violating 924(c) in this fashion or somebody who is liable for that carrying of explosives, carrying federal felonies in this fashion, aren't to serve that period of

```
incarceration. So that's -- at the highest level of generality, I think that's the government's assertion.
```

With respect to the criteria governing the motion, I suppose I would say that if I'm not focusing my comments in ways that are helpful to the Court, Your Honor, please let me know; but the government has disputed the notion that there are substantial questions at least with respect to the 844 explosives counts; and I can just say a few words about those issues.

Those counts are sustainable on either an aiding and abetting or a *Pinkerton* theory; and, of course, the government is aware that the Court had some questions at the time of trial about the applicability of those theories; but we don't think that any further developments in the law have undermined the validity of those convictions.

I'd start with the Pinkerton theory --

THE COURT: Well, wait, wait.

MR. YOUNG: Of course, the --

THE COURT: Wait, sorry. I don't want to hear those -- those motions are not explicitly before the Court, and I don't really want to get into them. I mean, you've discussed them somewhat in your papers on the bond issue, but let me ask you this: I believe now that every other defendant in this multi-defendant case has finished their term of incarceration; and, you know, unlike Kwon and Khan and the others, Mr. Timimi

did not go to Pakistan. He never touched a gun or an explosive. And the people who did touch the guns and explosives didn't get sentences anywhere near as draconian as his.

And so if you look at the entire case and all the players in the case, it is somewhat disconcerting to think that somebody as removed as he -- even if he were the instigator, the end of the instigation, the final acts of the instigation by other players in the conspiracy did not result in anywhere near as long a sentence as he is now serving.

And so I think that certainly is an equity factor that the Court has to have in mind. It goes into the exceptional circumstances factor that we have to look at, and this case has a ton of what I think are complex and difficult legal issues.

I know you, you say that there -- the government may win them; and you very well may; but the fact that the government might win the appeal does not necessarily mean that there are not meritorious issues, real, interesting, legal issues that are permeating this case such that in deciding whether or not the defendant ought to be at this point free from incarceration, which has the extra potential burden for him of a significant health problem should he become infected.

So I think this is a very unique case, and it's a, it's a troubling one, and so I'm not convinced that there's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
anything I've seen in your papers, in the government's papers
that really undercuts the defendant's argument that at this
juncture, this particular motion ought to be granted in his
favor.
                      This is Mr. Young. May I say a few words
          MR. YOUNG:
in response, Your Honor, that would be helpful to the Court?
          THE COURT:
                     Go ahead.
                      The first is the government takes Your
          MR. YOUNG:
Honor's point about codefendants, and, of course, Your Honor
recognized the point about instigation, but in the government's
view, I do want to underscore during this conference that, you
know, this defendant was in a leadership position in a critical
moment after the worst terrorist attack on American soil in
living memory and used that power and influence to direct
others on a course of committing treason against the United
States, and while it is true that the defendants who
successfully made it to the LeT camps were not able to get to
Afghanistan and pick up arms against Americans fighting the
Taliban, that could not have been known at the time on
September 16, when these events occurred. So I feel it's
important to say that, Your Honor, because that is the
government's view of the equitable balance of the case, and we
think it puts this defendant in a separate category.
          With respect to danger, I would be remiss, Your
Honor, if I did not say the follow-on, which is the Court is
```

entirely correct that the government did not raise the danger issue in its filing. We focused on other issues where we thought our arguments were stronger.

I would want to make the Court at least aware, this defendant was not always subject to the special administrative measures about which we informed the Court as an attachment to our filing to speak to whether or not he's at risk of contracting COVID-19 while incarcerated.

There was an event that occurred in about 2010 that led to the imposition of those measures; and since the Court does have to make a finding by clear and convincing evidence that he's not a danger, if the Court is leaning towards granting the motion, the government would respectfully request the opportunity to make a production to defense counsel and a filing just so the Court is aware of the circumstances surrounding imposition of those measures because they could be relevant to the Court's fact-finding; and I wanted to inform the Court of that. While it is not something that the government has focused on, if it comes down to that, it might be helpful for the Court to at least have that information.

And the last thing that I would say, Your Honor, you know, Your Honor described Mr. Al-Timimi as having serious health conditions.

THE COURT: Wait, wait. Stop, stop. Counsel, you've got to stop for a second. Are you rustling papers? What kind

```
12
 1
     of phone are you using right now? We're getting incredible
 2
     static on it.
               MR. YOUNG: I am standing stock-still on a cell
 3
     phone, Your Honor. I'm not rustling papers. I apologize.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Well, you've got to get some landlines at
     the U.S. Attorney's Office if you're going to be doing many of
 6
 7
     these conferences by phone because it's very difficult. I'm
 8
     not sure we're going to have a verbatim transcript because
 9
     you've been very hard to understand.
10
               Mr. Huff, have you been able to -- I'm sorry,
11
     Mr. Young, have you been able to -- I'm sorry, what are we
12
     looking at here?
13
               Mr. Huff, have you been able to hear clearly what
14
     Mr. Young is saying?
15
               MR. HUFF: Yes, I have, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: All right. Well --
17
               MR. HUFF: So I guess one thing I would say, in
18
     response to the SAM, it's interesting that the government
19
     mentions that because we've been objecting to the imposition of
20
     the SAM for at least three years in a row now. I've written an
21
     objection letter to the Board of Prisons basically saying I
22
     don't understand why the SAM has been imposed, and I've never
```

This is a, you know, a person that has not shown any

gotten any response. So it's almost a little bit too little

23

24

25

too late here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

propensity for violence, no classified information involved that he is privy to. So I, I don't see the justification there. THE COURT: Well, obviously, we don't have it. I mean, the government must believe that they have something; and that would be, I think, appropriate; and it probably should have been in the, in the response in the first place, because a question that I always want answered, and it was on my list to ask the government, was whether or not there had been any disciplinary infractions by Mr. Timimi within the last couple of years that would go to the issue of whether or not he posed any danger to the community; and so obviously, I don't have a complete record on that issue. Well, it's quite difficult to hear you-all; and I

think you've, you've briefed the issues well. I've sort of expressed to you my concerns about this case. I want to see what the government's argument is, what the evidence you have as to this issue of possible misbehavior by the defendant.

When was he moved? Where was he before, at Marion, before he went to Colorado? Where was he?

MR. YOUNG: This is Mr. Young. For a period, he was in the Eastern Neck, and between that time and Colorado, I do not know, and so I would invite, I suppose, either of my colleagues if they do know to respond.

MR. HUFF: The one thing that I know -- this is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 14 Thomas Huff. The one thing that I'm aware of, I've been on the case since 2014, and it was early 2015 that he was moved to However, my information is that the SAM order was imposed before that, around 20- (inaudible). THE COURT: All right. MR. KROMBERG: Your Honor, this is Gordon Kromberg. So the SAM, the special administrative measures, were imposed in 2010, when Timimi was still at Northern Neck. There had been a significant amount of time when he was at the Alexandria Detention Center; and then he had been moved to Northern Neck; and an incident arose while he was at Northern Neck which caused the imposition -- triggered the imposition of the SAM. THE COURT: And then did he go from 2010, was he then put in Super Max? How long has he been there? MR. KROMBERG: I can check right now. I think I have that information. Hang on. MR. HUFF: Your Honor, this is Thomas Huff. I'm aware of this because I was working on the case at the time. It was early 2015 that he was moved to ADX. THE COURT: But -- all right. Between 2010, when the SAM was imposed, and the time he gets moved into Super Max,
  - THE COURT: But -- all right. Between 2010, when the SAM was imposed, and the time he gets moved into Super Max, where is he in that five-year interval? I couldn't decipher the one attachment that I thought might have had his different locations. Was he ever at Atlanta?

MR. KROMBERG: I do not think so, Judge.

```
1
               THE COURT: Who just spoke?
 2
               MR. KROMBERG: I believe that is -- I'm looking at
 3
     something from 2012, when he was still at Northern Neck. I
 4
     will look at my documents from 2013 and 2014 momentarily.
 5
               As of 2013, he was still at Northern Neck; and in
     2014, as of April 1, 2014, he was still at Northern Neck.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: All right. So it sounds as though he may
 8
    have gotten -- gone directly from Northern Neck then to ADX.
 9
               MR. KROMBERG: As of 2015, as of April 2015, he was
10
     at U.S. Penitentiary in Hazelton, West Virginia.
11
               THE COURT: All right. Okay.
12
               MR. KROMBERG: And as I trace this through, I should
13
     be able to determine when he got to -- when he got where.
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Kromberg, though --
15
               MR. KROMBERG: He was still at Hazelton, West
16
     Virginia, as of -- my records show he was still at Hazelton,
17
     West Virginia, as of March 2016; and as of March 2017, he was
18
     at the U.S. Penitentiary in Florence, Colorado.
19
               THE COURT: All right. My understanding is that
20
     people normally are not moved into Florence, because that is
21
     the ultimate holding facility, unless they've had significant
22
     problems in other institutions and/or they've been convicted of
     an offense that, you know, automatically sort of puts them
23
24
     there, like Mr. Moussaoui and the shoe bomber.
25
               Is there anything in this record to suggest as to why
```

- 1 he didn't go directly to Florence, why there was this delay, if
- 2 he's such a serious inmate?
- MR. KROMBERG: Your Honor, this is Mr. Kromberg. I
- 4 do not have any information on why he was moved to Florence per
- 5 se, but the information about why the SAMs were imposed might
- 6 have an effect on what the Bureau of Prisons decided to do --
- 7 excuse me, the sequence of events including the events of 2010
- 8 | are likely to have had an impact on where he went.
- 9 THE COURT: All right. Well, I still --
- 10 MR. TURLEY: Your Honor, this is Jonathan Turley. My
- 11 | cocounsel was not counsel back then, so I just wanted to give
- 12 the Court the benefit of my recollection. I was counsel
- 13 through this period.
- I, I am not sure what Mr. Kromberg is referencing
- 15 | with regard to Northern Neck. My understanding is that
- 16 Dr. Al-Timimi had an excellent record at Northern Neck.
- 17 He was then transferred to the interim facility. We
- 18 were never told why he was transferred, but I was never told by
- 19 anyone at any time that he was transferred to Colorado because
- 20 he had had any disciplinary problems or that he was a danger in
- 21 any regard.
- 22 THE COURT: All right. Well, I think that would help
- 23 to inform my decision, so I would like to get that,
- 24 Mr. Kromberg, as soon as you can, all right?
- MR. KROMBERG: Yes, ma'am.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: All right. The other issue while I have
you-all on the phone is the defense have raised the issue that
some of the classified information that was such a thorn in
everybody's side, because as you will recall, Mr. Kromberg, and
I think, Mr. Turley, you were on the case at that time as well,
that the information was considered so classified that the
government would not allow my law clerks to help me with it, so
I said, well, until I get a law clerk who can work on it, I'm
not touching it, and that's why it went into hold for so long,
but you've represented in your papers, Mr. Turley and Mr. Huff,
that some of that information has been declassified or the
classification is lowered, and so there may be more
accessibility to it.
          MR. KROMBERG: Your Honor, this is Gordon Kromberg.
Can I, can I interject for just a moment, I think, to clarify
the record?
          THE COURT: Yeah.
          MR. KROMBERG: So that the document, the information
that was so highly classified has not been disclosed to the
defense, but that was the subject of Your Honor's ruling in
2014.
          THE COURT: Right.
          MR. KROMBERG: The document that is now at issue was,
was classified but it wasn't, it wasn't the type of sensitivity
that was the -- that your clerk would not be cleared for.
                                                           The
```

- document that's now at issue was provided to your chambers in
- 2 | 2007 as a part of one of the government's ex parte filings; and
- 3 the government has provided a somewhat redacted version of it
- 4 to the defense, I guess it was earlier this year.
- 5 So just, just for the purposes of the record, the
- 6 things that, that held the case up that your clerk could not be
- 7 | cleared for, that is over. This is one particular document the
- 8 Court has in its file, because I filed it --
- 9 THE COURT: Right.
- 10 MR. KROMBERG: -- more than 13 years ago, and the
- 11 defense has not seen it in unredacted form, but they have seen
- 12 most of it at this point, Your Honor.
- 13 THE COURT: Okay. All right.
- 14 MR. TURLEY: Well, Your Honor -- and this is Jonathan
- 15 Turley. If I could establish our position on this, the, the
- 16 document, the Squad IT-3 document is indeed unclassified. Our
- 17 | understanding is that the material that has not been disclosed
- 18 | is being withheld under some type of law enforcement privilege.
- 19 Mr. Kromberg may be able to clarify that. But I do not believe
- 20 that that document is classified.
- 21 We've also asked for discovery on a number of
- 22 | serialized investigations that are mentioned in the IT-3
- 23 | document. These are investigations that are, include 217423
- 24 and 222852 as well as others. We don't know the status of
- 25 those -- that information because we've never been given

discovery as to those investigations.

And also, just to clarify something that Mr. Kromberg said, we have also raised the Ammerman report, which was also raised with the Fourth Circuit. We don't know the status of all the information underlying that, but in both of these incidents, we have raised what we believe are glaring contradictions with what the government has said to the Court in the past as to its own orders, in fact, in contradiction of what the Court has said in the case as to its understanding of any investigations before 2003; but we also have noted that these documents, included Squad IT-3, make direct reference not only to Dr. Al-Timimi but to matters that were involved at trial. They were material matter. So that's the reason we've made these discovery requests.

But in this mix, there is clearly unclassified material with regard to Squad IT-3, and then there's the serialized investigation which we are really still in the dark on.

THE COURT: All right. Well -- all right. That's not before us right now. We'll take a look at that. I want to try to get this case -- or the things that are on our calendar wrapped up in the not-too-distant future, but the issue that's pending right now is the one about whether the defendant should be released on bond pending appeal, and I want to see what the government has as to any disciplinary infractions that

```
Mr. Timimi may have accumulated in the time he's been in
 1
 2
     custody and the reasons why a SAM has been imposed and actually
 3
     what the SAM restrictions are.
 4
               So, Mr. Kromberg, you need to get that information to
 5
     the Court and, of course, to defense counsel, all right?
               MR. KROMBERG: Yes, ma'am.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: All right. While we are on the phone,
 8
     because I know it's been hard for my reporter to hear
 9
     everthing, Anneliese, is there anything that you want any of
10
     the counsel to spell out for you? Did you get everything in
11
     terms of particularly the numbers and the letters that
12
     Mr. Turley was referencing? Did you get all of that?
13
               THE COURT REPORTER: Is it Squad IT-3?
14
               THE COURT: Squad IT-3? Do we have that correct,
15
     Mr. Turley, Squad, S-q-u-a-d?
16
               MR. TURLEY: Squad IT-3, yes.
17
               THE COURT: IT-3, okay. It's IT, right, as in
18
     international --
               MR. TURLEY: Yes, IT.
19
20
               THE COURT: All right, thank you.
21
               Anything further? If not, then we're signing off.
22
     Thank you for participating by phone. I think next time, I'm
23
     going to make you come to court because this was a little bit
24
     difficult.
25
               MR. TURLEY: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

		21
1	THE COURT: All right?	
2	MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor.	
3	(Which were all the proceedings	
4	had at this time.)	
5		
6	CERTIFICATE OF THE REPORTER	
7	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of	
8	the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.	
9		
10		
11	/s/ Anneliese J. Thomson	
12	Ameriese o. momson	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		